

ERIC Document Resume		See Instruction Sheet		DATE OF RESUME 6/22/65		DATE RECEIVED	
A. PUBLICATION DATA							
1. ERIC NUMBER ED000117		2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S) 7455		3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.		DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW	
4. AUTHOR(S): Alexander, William M. and Carmichael, Bennie						MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐	
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Teacher Education at George Peabody College for Teachers: Past, Present, and Future						COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☒ NO ☐	
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.						COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐	
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.				8. PLACE OF ORIGIN		TYPE OF REPORT	
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE George Peabody College for Teachers				ORG. George Peabody ST. College for Teachers CITY. Nashville, Tenn.		PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐	
10. VOL. N.A.		11. PAGES N.A.		12. MO./YR. 60		13. TOTAL PP. 15	
				TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE		OTHER ERIC REFERENCES: ERIC SATELLITE CODE	
B. INDEXING DATA							
14. SUBJECT AREA				15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR Report			
16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)							
teacher edu.		secondary edu.		development		teaching aids	
professional edu.		interinstitutional cooperation		students		curriculum	
fellowship programs		research		identification			
				teachers			
17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)							
Describes recent experimentation in teacher education at Peabody, including a fifth-year fellowship program for preparation of high school teachers, and a cooperative program with selected schools in the Southern region for research and development aimed at improving quality of teaching in schools and colleges. Discusses changing emphases in the 1960's in areas of selection of teacher education candidates, individual differences among teachers and teacher trainees, increased academic competence, minimum foundation in field of professional education, and the use of mechanical aids in individualizing instruction.							
ERIC No. 18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT							
C. FUNDING DATA							
19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION				20. DIVISION OR DEPT.		21. CONTRACT NO.	
						PROJECT NO.	
				22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT			
				23. DURATION OR PROJECT		U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education	

5-18
R

HE 7455 \$V

(Copy of manuscript prepared for The High School Journal (March, 1960) by Wm. M. Alexander and Bennie Carmichael--duplicated for possible reaction and discussion in appropriate Peabody Department of Education committees)

ED000117

TEACHER EDUCATION AT
GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

The for Teachers in the title of George Peabody College bears special significance to its staff, alumni, and the profession and public in general. It serves as a reminder of the institution's basic commitment in higher education. Through this important function it identifies its status and bids for prestige and recognition among the outstanding and prominent colleges and universities of the region and nation. Essential to the strength of the institution are the strong liberal arts departments, providing the academic training for recipients of the Bachelor of Arts Degree, whose prominent and competent staff members contribute greatly to teacher education through their understanding of, interest in, and commitment to professional education.

From the Beginning

One of the noble aspirations of Mr. George Peabody was to uplift the profession of teaching. Selected by Barnas Sears, the first agent of the George Peabody Fund, the University of Nashville seemed most suited for creating The Peabody Normal School in 1875 to serve the South. Reflecting the growing commitment to its high purpose--the training of teachers and educational leaders for the South and the nation--the Fund was dissolved in 1905 and ultimately nearly two million dollars was used to help establish George Peabody College for Teachers on its new campus in 1914. George Peabody's theme--"Education, a debt due from present to future generations"--was to be executed in the South through benefits which would "be distributed

ED000117

among the entire population, without other distinction than their needs and the opportunities of usefulness to them." Thus, opportunities were provided for the preparation of teachers when (such as now) "Teachers were wanted" and needed but were not available from the liberal arts institutions.

From fifty years back, when the normal school preparation was considered adequate, we have come to require the four years of undergraduate training; great emphasis has been placed on graduate preparation, to the point of questioning the adequacy of the four-year undergraduate program; and continually we have sought a better understanding of the balance that should exist in liberal arts and professional preparation for teachers and educational leaders.

Looking back over fifty years of development in teacher education and focusing attention on the problem for fifty to come, Peabody's illustrious president, Dr. Bruce R. Payne, in 1930, before the Teachers College Section of the Department of Superintendence, identified these four theories of teacher preparation:

1. . . . efficiency in subject matter is of primary importance, . . . knowledge of the subject is all that is necessary, and practice is of secondary importance. This system (he continued) has been followed too often by schools of engineering and also by liberal arts colleges in the training of high school teachers.
2. . . . efficiency is in practice with subject matter in the background. (He cited) the project method and the old-time theory of normal school training (as) illustrations of this.
3. The third, known as professionalized subject matter, advocates the selection of subject matter but with its presentation in relation to the job to be done. This is quite an advance over the others and is illustrated by premedical chemistry and, in fact, (stated Dr. Payne) by most of the science work done in the senior academic year which is credited toward the first year of medicine.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

4. The fourth might be described as a cooperative theory in which the study of subject matter and practice are concurrent. The modern progressive teachers college sponsors this plan (he concluded).

Peabody to the present has pursued this modern progressive teachers college approach but through study and research has found good reason to expand and amplify its implications. The changing roles of education and the teacher coupled with an increasing shortage of certified teachers and renewed emphasis on improving the quality of education have made new and significant study of the college's role in teacher education essential.

Recent Experimentation in Teacher Education at Peabody

Some modern developments in Peabody's preparation of high school teachers began in 1951 with the Carnegie Fellowship Program in Teaching. It was believed that an important potential for teacher preparation, the liberal arts college graduates, could be tapped through a fifth-year program emphasizing both professional education and a greater depth and breadth in an academic teaching field.

Approximately twenty students have been enrolled in the program each year. First priority has been given to candidates with no professional education, providing of course that these candidates were superior to candidates with limited professional training. Carnegie fellows have demonstrated growing social maturity as they have grown professionally through the added four quarters.

Programs of study for Carnegie fellows take the form of an individually planned course. Considerations in program planning include the detailed undergraduate background of the student, certification requirements, and special needs of the student, both academic and professional. The Carnegie

groups have maintained outstanding grade-point averages and have been superior in qualities that appear to be predictive of teaching success. On surveys of their teaching success, responses reflect a flavor of freshness, an enthusiasm for teaching, and a professional spirit that is rarely matched anywhere. They voice almost universal appreciation of the Carnegie assistance and often indicate that it was decisive in terms of their choices and continuation in the teaching profession.

In 1953, Peabody and Vanderbilt University inaugurated a joint three-year Master of Arts in Teaching Program with a grant from The Fund for the Advancement of Education. The three-year experiment in the training of secondary teachers was undertaken to demonstrate a new approach to preparing secondary teachers. It was assumed that sound undergraduate liberal arts training provided a desirable foundation on which to build a fifth year of work. In this year a student was able not only to receive his professional training on a graduate level at Peabody but also to enjoy and profit by the stimulation of advanced academic study at Vanderbilt. In the second place, the program was designed to attract outstanding prospects into the teaching field. Finally, it provided the opportunity for two institutions of widely differing character to cooperate in a program which enabled each to make its own peculiar contribution to teacher training.

The sixty quarter hours of work required for the degree was divided equally between academic and professional education. The professional training was designed to provide the basic essentials necessary for a secondary school teacher and to meet, in general, minimum certification requirements. For additional training in their academic fields, students continued study at the graduate level. A consultant appraising the program concluded:

In conception, the Master of Arts in Teaching Program is not only sound but distinctive, challenging, and full of promise. It is an idea which has significance for teachers living everywhere, and the Nashville situation offers a unique opportunity to put it to the test of practice under the most favorable conditions.

A more recent development at Peabody in teacher education, beginning in 1957, involves the College in cooperation with selected school systems in the Southern region in a program of research and development aimed at improving the quality of teaching in the schools and colleges. This program was made possible by a two-year grant from The Fund for the Advancement of Education and is being continued under a second grant effective July 1, 1959. Special consideration is being given to better utilization of teaching personnel and other teaching resources. The experimentation is being concentrated in rural and suburban county school systems in the South where critical shortages in educational manpower and resources already exist and at the College, where the training of personnel for the implementation of new ideas is emphasized. It is held that a sound program in educational improvement develops in these three stages:

1. The creative thinking and laboratory research phase. New ideas are sought and tested under laboratory conditions.
2. The field trial and demonstration phase. In this phase, ideas are subjected to various field conditions. Practical difficulties are ironed out and practitioners are informed.
3. The personnel training phase. In this phase, teachers and school leaders are trained for the implementation of new ideas.

During the first two years of the program ten separate research studies were initiated--all designed to improve the quality of instruction by effecting better use of teaching resources. Eight of the ten experiments

See p 14

were conducted jointly by Peabody College and cooperating school systems. These eight studies dealt with (1) making better use of professional personnel, (2) utilizing the summer months for special enrichment instruction, (3) using nonprofessional personnel to assist teachers with clerical and routine duties, and (4) making use of new instructional media.

The other two projects initiated during the first two years of the program on the Peabody campus, educational television and team approaches to college teaching, deal with aspects of college teaching and teacher education. Another project involving the development of ways for more effective utilization of test results for curriculum planning is under field trial this year; while results of much of the earlier study and research is now entering the third phase of development--the personnel training phase.

Changing Emphases for the 1960's

During this year, 1959-60, various Peabody faculty groups are considering or implementing changes in the teacher education program to meet the needs of the foreseeable future, the 1960's. A committee on Admission to Teacher Education began work in 1958-59, as did a General Policies and Planning Committee for Teacher Education. Currently four committees of the Department of Education are developing programs relating to the following problems: recruitment and selection of prospective leaders of teachers; reorganization of pre-service teacher education; reorganization of the graduate education program; and laboratory experiences in the Peabody Demonstration School. Each of these groups has a nucleus membership from the Department of Education and calls on faculty members from other

departments as consultants. Such a flexible plan of interdepartmental cooperation is especially appropriate in a college for teachers where all departments focus on teacher education.

Certain needs for and of teachers of the 1960's are giving major direction to these current studies and program changes:

1. Higher quality of teaching personnel
2. Individual differences among teachers and teacher trainees
3. Increased academic competence
4. Minimum foundation in the field of education
5. Coordination of laboratory and classroom experiences in specific training courses
6. Use of mechanical aids and new teaching media in individualizing instruction

Selection of teacher education candidates. A few years ago certain changes were made in Peabody's program to permit students not wishing to qualify as teachers to graduate without fulfilling the requirements in professional education heretofore mandatory for all Peabody graduates. Although some 90 per cent of our students still elect to meet the latter requirements, that is to train for teaching, it now becomes especially important to have admission requirements for teacher education that are different and even more stringent than the general college admission requirements.

It is recognized full well that at Peabody as in teacher education institutions in general we are caught in the horns of a dilemma--on the one hand, the certain-to-continue shortage of qualified teachers, and, on the other, the great need of the schools and of the nation in general for

teachers of only the highest personal and professional qualifications. In view of its distinctive leadership function, Peabody must elect to place first emphasis on quality. In the long run higher standards of admission and training will result in a greater supply of well-qualified teachers, or so we believe.

Accordingly, proposals now before the Peabody faculty aim to establish a more definite screening procedure for admission to the teacher education program. The screening is to be institutional in nature and is to be accomplished by the third quarter of the sophomore year or upon entrance to the college beyond the sophomore year. The screening will be based on the student's academic average and placement examination results, along with his physical and personality traits, and the major department's recommendation. The critical average on academic work will be higher than for general admission of transfer students.

Certain changes also recently made with regard to standards for admission to advanced graduate work, reflect the concern of Peabody's faculty for the quality of teacher education and its leadership. A critical score has been set for the doctoral aptitude examinations which are prerequisite to screening for doctoral work at Peabody. Certain more specific standards are also being considered for admission to studies leading toward the degree of Specialist in Education (Ed.S), a program that attracts many supervisors of teachers and also present and prospective members of teacher education faculties.

Individual differences among teachers and teacher trainees. Many Peabody faculty members believe that greater specialization is inevitable among teachers of the 1960's. We suspect that the current widespread

experimentation with classification of teaching functions and teaching competencies will result in many categories of teachers other than the familiar ones associated with curriculum fields. Already Peabody trains many teachers of exceptional children and specialists in various types of guidance and other special services. It is hoped that our training program of long standing for librarians will soon be supplemented by one for specialists in materials of many types, and already we are actively engaged in training teachers for television teaching.

In addition consideration is presently being given to the potential demand for teachers of large classes, of small groups, and of individual pupils. Since this demand will probably be met through the selection and further training of teachers already in service who show particular aptitudes for one of these aspects of teaching, our immediate need is seen to be that of providing all of our teacher trainees some preliminary experience in each aspect. As rapidly as we can locate good laboratory situations for this purpose, student teachers will have opportunity to try out in work with large classes as well as in the more conventional ones with their small group and individual work.

It is also recognized that the quality of performance in teaching can be predicted or identified early in the career of the teacher trainee. Poor performers must be discouraged or eliminated. At the other extreme, an honors program for outstanding seniors at Peabody is providing an opportunity to give student teachers in the honors group somewhat different experiences which challenge the high ability student to apply his ability to teaching from the beginning.

Program changes at Peabody are being planned to make possible considerably more individualization of the entire teacher education program. We recognize at least four different groups of students for whom programs tailor-made to students' backgrounds and aspirations are essential:

1. The students who wish to be trained and certified to teach at the end of four years of college--for these the usual combination of general education, teaching field specialization, and professional courses seems to need relatively little revision at present.

2. The students who determine before the senior year their interest in extending preparation for teaching through a fifth year--for these some postponement of certain professional courses, especially student teaching, and greater concentration of academic work appears desirable.

3. The students who determine immediately after graduation from a liberal arts college their interest in a fifth year of preparation for teaching--these we have been working with in the Carnegie and M.A.T. programs already described. For some of these with unusual ability and teaching potential there may be needed a supervised apprenticeship in teaching of a more responsible nature than the usual student teaching program.

4. The mature person who decides after experience in some other occupation, including that of housewife, to prepare for teaching--for these persons, presenting wide variations in college backgrounds and in teaching potential, no uniform program seems possible nor desirable, although for the most promising ones with baccalaureate degrees the supervised apprenticeship mentioned above is probably especially appropriate.

Increased academic competence. The widely-recognized explosion of knowledge in all academic fields is one to which Peabody's community of academic and professional educators is fully sensitive. Textbook writers and lecturers as well as teacher-scholars, many of our professors are more than ever impressed with the great need to provide depth in the training of secondary school teachers (and also of elementary school ones). The measures suggested above with regard to standards of admission and individualization of teacher education, especially those which relate to extension of the period of training, will help at Peabody. Perhaps the

greatest problem graduate schools of education face, however, is that of the many teachers who wish to complete a master's program with little or no depth in one or more academic fields.

Facing, too, the problem posed by certification and employment practices for school administrators, we have had to allow many teachers to work for the M.A. in school administration and related fields. Regrettably but certainly, these teachers go into administrative work without the real mastery of academic work which would give them an added and greatly needed competence in the growing number of school communities whose citizens are as well or better educated in academic fields as the one-time community scholar, the school administrator. Even more regrettable and just as certain, many of these teachers go back to their classrooms well-versed in administrative procedures they have no chance to use and not a whit better-versed in the subject matter they are to continue teaching. Hence at Peabody we are trying to discourage teachers from forsaking their academic majors in M.A. work, and to insist, in accordance with Peabody tradition, on an academic major for the master's degree. Many of us also fervently hope that the 1960's will see sufficient inducement for able teachers to stay in their classrooms that fewer numbers of them will seek degrees and jobs in administration or guidance as a way of securing salary increases they deserve as teachers!

Minimum foundation in the field of professional education. Although certain graduate courses in education have been recommended if not required of all graduate students at Peabody, for some two years the Department of Education has been re-evaluating these courses and indeed the entire question

of what constitutes a minimum foundation for the professional worker in education. The problem is somewhat confounded by the growing number of students seeking M.A. degrees before having teaching experience. We have been aware, too, of the existence of certain repetitions, overlappings, and omissions in the graduate courses. Furthermore, at Peabody, there is a unique opportunity to bring into contact with the present and prospective teacher many teacher-scholars in the academic teaching fields as well as from the Department of Education.

Currently the proposal which seems most likely of implementation is one to require of all persons working or expecting to work in schools and colleges a course yet to be fully defined in each of the following areas:

1. The development and status of public education in the United States
2. Education and current issues in American life
3. The learning process and the individual
4. The school and its program.

The plan provides for these courses to be taken in the above sequence and for each to be offered on a large-class, team-teaching basis. There will be a definite, detailed syllabus for each course, and it is hoped that students who have had related preparation or who are of unusual ability may satisfy the requirement by examination or independent study and examination. Each course will have a professor in charge, and will utilize a number of cooperating professors, each for an appropriate phase of the course. The professors will be chosen on the basis of their special competencies regardless of departmental affiliation. It is expected that this program will be introduced experimentally in the fall quarter, 1960.

Coordination of laboratory and classroom experiences. At Peabody there has been a long history of cooperation between the supervisors of student teaching and the instructors of special methods courses. However, special conditions in the major field departments have resulted in some inconsistencies in the nature of laboratory experiences and in their relationship to classroom instruction in methods. Currently a committee of the Demonstration School faculty with consultative help from the college is developing a guide to laboratory experiences in the Demonstration School which should result in more uniform practices.

Meetings of the Department of Education's Committee on Pre-Service Teacher Education with professors who teach the special methods courses are being devoted to ironing out schedule and other problems which have restricted full use of laboratory experiences. Consideration is being given here also to the possibilities of more extended student experience in the laboratory school prior to the student teaching experience in off-campus schools. Particular attention is being devoted to the breadth of the student's experience with mechanical aids, libraries, tests, records, and other of the indispensable resources of the modern teacher.

A new design for staffing the student teaching program is considered promising. To assist in the growing and more individual program, Peabody has arranged with a nearby school system for the loan of well-qualified persons seeking further training in the field of supervision. It is expected that this arrangement will bring into the student teaching program additional practical assistance and that it may also extend the cooperation of Peabody with school systems in leadership training. Perhaps this procedure might be more fully utilized to help supervision of both pre-service and in-service teachers.

Use of mechanical aids in individualizing instruction. Instead of viewing automation of teaching with alarm, our Peabody planners are seeking ways of utilizing the great potential of modern mechanical aids to effect the individualization of instruction good teachers had been hoping for throughout this century. With our closed-circuit television facility, we are continuously exploring ways of igniting the student's enthusiasm for learning. Teaching machines are being investigated to see if there are here easier and surer ways of inducing self-teaching. Peabody's educational psychologists are giving substantial assistance in the use of tests and records in the Demonstration School by student teachers.

Much attention is now being given by the entire Demonstration School faculty and its committees to readying the school for a demonstration-type workshop this coming summer on "Individualizing Instruction Through Mechanical Aids." It is expected that workshop members will see in classroom operation the best of modern aids to instruction, focused on their effective use for stimulating and aiding the learning process. New aids are being procured for this purpose, and faculty members are actively engaged in their utilization and evaluation.

The Peabody Demonstration School, a conventional structure, is far from being perfectly adapted to experimentation with large and small classes and to the most effective utilization of many types of aids. Nevertheless, the faculty is making ingenious adaptations even in the very kind of school plant so widely regarded as inhibiting the kind of teaching possible in this age of automation and flexibility. Certainly demonstrations in this setting should be uniquely appropriate to the majority of high school buildings in the South.

Summary: Essential Factors in Improving Teacher Education

Past and current efforts to improve teacher education at Peabody indicate that at least three factors have been and are essential in the improvement process. First of all, curriculum planning in a college for teachers, just as in a school for children, is effective only as the professional staff members do their own planning rather than accept or imitate plans made elsewhere. Secondly, improvement efforts become more effective as they are cooperatively planned and implemented by all those who train teachers--that is, by professors from all departments concerned. Such cooperation is a unique feature of George Peabody College for Teachers. Third, administrative support in developing experimental programs, even in making mistakes, is essential. As these three factors continue to be characteristic of Peabody, our faculty should continue to be able to develop and maintain programs of teacher education equal to whatever challenges the future provides.